REMARKS

The applicants note with appreciation the acknowledgement of the claim for priority under section 119 and the notice that all of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

The applicants acknowledge and appreciate receiving an initialed copy of the form PTO-1449 that was filed on 11 July 2003. However, a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement was filed on 21 September 2004. A single Japanese reference was cited on a form PTO-1449 in the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement of 21 September 2004. The applicants have not yet received an initialed copy of the form PTO-1449 that was filed with the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request an initialed copy of that form.

Claims 1-30 are pending. Claim 30 is new. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

The claims have been amended to correct minor errors and to clarify the language. However, no amendment has been made in response to the rejections. The applicants response to the rejection is as follows.

Claims 1-5, 13, 16-21, and 24-26 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by the patent to Williams. The applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn for the following reasons.

In the patent to Williams, a wheel unit is attached to each wheel (tire) of a vehicle (see column 3, lines 27 to 46 and column 4, lines 11 to 22). Each wheel unit has wheel identification DIP switches set differently from the other wheel units on the same vehicle. In addition, a

vehicle unit is attached to the vehicle remote from the wheels. DIP switches are located on the vehicle unit. Digital information identifying the particular wheel having incorrect pressure is transmitted by the wheel unit that is fixed to the wheel having incorrect air pressure to the vehicle attachable unit.

To match each of the wheel units with the vehicle unit on the same vehicle, the DIP switches of the vehicle unit on the vehicle are initially set by the user to be identical to those of each of the wheel units on the same vehicle (see column 4, lines 32 to 45).

The settings of the wheel identification DIP switches of the wheel units determine part of the digital information transmitted by the wheel units to the vehicle unit on the particular vehicle when a tire pressure problem is sensed (see column 4, lines 46 to 56). Therefore, if the identification DIP switches of the vehicle attachable unit are not set to be the same as those of each transmitting wheel attachable unit, the vehicle unit will not electronically recognize the signal (digital information), or the unit, as being proper; thus, unrecognized units will not cause the vehicle operator to receive an alert.

It is apparent from this information that the apparatus of the Williams patent requires a user to initially set the wheel identification DIP switches of each wheel unit on a particular vehicle to match with the vehicle identification DIP switches of the vehicle unit of the same vehicle. Consequently, the vehicle unit can identify a wheel having incorrect tire air pressure based on digital information representative of the wheel number of the wheel with the incorrect tire air pressure.

Note that Williams fails to perform registration of an identification of each wheel attachable unit in the vehicle attachable unit. This is because the vehicle attachable unit can identify from where the digital information is transmitted by checking the of the wheel

identification DIP switch setting information, which is included in the transmitted information. That is, the vehicle attachable unit checks for a match with the vehicle identification DIP switch of the vehicle attachable unit. Therefore, it is not necessary to perform registration in the method of the Williams patent. Alternatively, one could view the manual setting of the DIP switches as a registration. However, the patent to Williams fails to disclose or suggest registering a unit when an unlikely signal is received.

Unlike the apparatus of Williams, the present invention permits a unit to be registered without using DIP switches and without switching the vehicle unit to a registration mode, as mentioned in the background section of the application. Consequently, in order to simply and clearly identify whether identification information is being transmitted from an associated wheel unit or a foreign wheel unit, the present invention employs an unlikely signal, which is unlikely to be transmitted under normal circumstances. This prevents registration of foreign wheel units.

Therefore, the patent to Williams fails to disclose or suggest registration of a wheel unit with the use of an unlikely signal to prevent the registration of a foreign tire air pressure sensor device. Therefore, claims 1-5, 13, 16-21, and 24-26 are patentably distinguishable over Williams and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 27 was rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by the patent to Mock et al. The applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn for the following reasons.

In the patent to Mock et al., a reference identification signal is pre-stored in a receiver (signal processing device 29), which serves as a vehicle unit. Identification signals unique to a wheel unit (elements 18, 21-23, 25-26, and 28) are transmitted by the wheel units. The receiver processes received signals only when the received identification signal matches with a reference identification number stored in the receiver. Registration is performed by switching the vehicle

unit to a special mode, called a pairing mode. See col. 9, lines 49-60. Therefore, the patent to Mock et al. fails to disclose or suggest registration when an unlikely signal is received, as claimed in claim 1.

The patent to Mock et al. thus fails to disclose or suggest registration of a wheel unit with the use of an unlikely signal to prevent the registration of a foreign tire air pressure sensor device. Therefore, claim 27 is patentably distinguishable over Mock et al. and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 30 is new and, like claim 1, recites that registration is accomplished when an unlikely signal is received by the pressure monitoring unit. Therefore, like claim 1, claim 30 is patentably distinguished from Williams and Mock et al.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. A timely notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If questions relating to patentability remain, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone.

Please charge any unforeseen fees that may be due to Deposit Account No. 50-1147.

Respectfully submitted,

James E. Barlow
Reg. No. 32,377

Posz & Bethards, PLC
11250 Roger Bacon Drive, Suite 10
Reston, VA 20190
Phone 703-707-9110
Fax 703-707-9112
Customer No. 23400